DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 599 UD 027 847

TITLE Chapter 1/Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs: 1989-90 Peer Tutoring Program End-of-Year Report. OREA Report.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.

PUB DATE Oct 90

NOTE 20p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS After School Programs; Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education; *Dropout Prevention; Dropout Programs; English (Second Language); Federal Programs; High Risk Students; High Schools; *High School Students; *Peer Teaching; Program Evaluation; State Programs; *Tutoring; Urban Schools

IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The New York City high schools participating in the 1989/90 Peer Tutoring Program demonstrated excellent performance in reaching program objectives. The Peer Tutoring Program serves high school students who have failed to achieve specified levels of achievement in mathematics, reading/writing, or English as a Second Language. Higher-achieving students provide tutoring in one-to-one or small group sessions either before or after school. A few schools also provided in-classroom tutorials. The program is funded in low-income schools by Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act and in other schools by New York State's Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (PCEN) Program. Sixty-two of the 71 participating schools responded with evaluation information on 721 tutors and 7,492 students. Ninety-seven percent of the schools met the first objective of at least 25 students participating in the before- or after-school programs. The program as a whole met the second objective of at least 50 percent of the participants in the before- and after-school programs participating for at least 9 hours of instruction, and the third objective of at least 70 percent of the participants in classroom tutorials passing the class in which they were being tutored. Eighty percent of the schools met the fourth objective of training at least five tutors. Many of the schools expressed interest in implementing computer-assisted tutorial instruction in future programs. Statistical data are presented in three tables. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OREA Report

CHAPTER 1/
PUPILS WITH COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
1989-90 PEER TUTORING PROGRAM
END-OF-YEAR REPORT
October, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 327 617

UD

CHAPTER 1/
PUPILS WITH COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL NEEDS
1989-90 PEER TUTORING PROGRAM
END-OF-YEAR REPORT
October, 1990

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Gwendolyn C. Baker
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Carol A. Gresser
Westina L. Matthews
Michael J. Petrides
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

7/3/90

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Peer Tutoring program serves high school students who have failed to achieve specified levels of accomplishment in math, reading/writing, or English as a Second Language. Higher achieving students provide tutoring in one-to-one or small group sessions either before or after school, or in classroom tutorials.

The Peer Tutoring program is financed either by Chapter 1 or by Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.E.N.) Chapter 1 is federally funded. A school is eligible for these funds if a certain proportion of its students meets the low-income citywide cutoff. P.C.E.N. is funded on the state level. A school is eligible for these funds if a certain proportion of its students fails to meet specific academic standards.

In 1989-90, 71 schools participated in the Peer Tutoring program. The 62 schools that completed OREA's data retrieval forms indicated that, in 1989-90, 721 tutors assisted 7,492 students from grades nine through twelve.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Peer Tutoring program had four objectives. The first objective stated that at least 25 students at each site would participate in the before- or after-school program during the school year. The second objective stipulated that at least 50 percent of the students enrolled in the before- or after-school program would participate for nine or more hours of tutorial instruction. The third objective stated that at least 70 percent of the students participating in classroom tutorials would pass the class in which they were receiving tutoring. The fourth objective stated that each site would train at least five tutors in methods and use of materials during the school year.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The participating schools demonstrated excellent performance in reaching the objectives of the program. Ninety-seven percent of the schools met the first objective. The program as a whole (although not individual schools) surpassed the second and third objectives, and 80 percent of the schools met the fourth objective.

A considerable number of schools indicated interest in implementing such strategies as computer-assisted tutorial instruction in the future. OREA recommends that the schools be assisted in developing these options and that their educational impact be assessed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

OREA is grateful to the Division of High School's area superintendents' offices and the schools in the program who provided the information on which this report was based. Thanks are also due to Mabel Payne, Henry Francis, and Dr. Linda Solomon who participated in data collection, data analysis, and the organization of the report.

Additional copies are available by writing to:
Dr. Lori Mei
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
High School Evaluation Unit
110 Livingston St., Room 740
Brooklyn, New York 11201.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
PROGRAM OUTCOMES	3
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Number and Percentage of Students in the Before- or After-School Peer Tutoring Program Who Attended At Least Nine Hours of Tutoring	4
2	Number and Percentage of Students in the Before- Or After-School Peer Tutoring Program Who Attended At Least Nine Hours of Tutoring by Type of Tutoring Received	7
3	Number of Tutors and Number of Trained Tutors Per Site	8

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Peer Tutoring program serves students who have scored below a statewide reference point in specified reading or mathematics tests; or have failed a Regents Competency Test in reading/writing, or math; or have scored at or below the 40th percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). Students in the Peer Tutoring program receive individualized or small group peer assistance in one or more of the following areas: math, reading/writing, and English as a Second Language (E.S.L). Peer assistance is provided either before or after school or within a remedial class. Tutors are higher achieving students who are employed as student aides and trained in remediation. Tutees are referred for tutoring by classroom teachers or guidance counselors. In each school, a coordinating teacher oversees the program, supervising the tutors and consulting with the classroom teachers.

The Peer Tutoring program has two funding sources: Chapter 1 and Pupils with Compensatory Educational Needs (P.C.E.N.). Chapter 1 is federally funded. A school is eligible for Chapter 1 funds if a certain proportion of its students meets the low-income citywide cutoff. P.C.E.N. is funded on the state level. A school is eligible for P.C.E.N. funding if a certain proportion of its students fails to meet specific academic standards.

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) conducted an evaluation of the 1989-90 Chapter 1/P.C.E.N. Peer

Tutoring program. OREA sent two surveys to every participating school: a questionnaire on tutors and the training provided to tutors, and a roster form on tutees and the extent and type of tutoring received.

In 1989-90, 71 schools participated in the Peer Tutoring program. Eighty-seven percent (62) of the participating schools completed the data retrieval forms; this report is based on those schools. Of those schools that reported a funding source, sixty-four percent (38 schools) reported that their Peer Tutoring program was funded by Chapter 1; 36 percent (21 schools) reported that their Peer Tutoring program was funded by P.C.E.N.

Sixty-one schools completed the student rosters. These schools reported that a total of 7,492 pupils had received tutoring either before or after school or during class tutorials. The ages of the tutees ranged from 12 to 23, with an average age of 16 (S.D. = 1.9). The proportion of students receiving services was highest in the lower grades as follows: grade nine: 2,515 pupils (34 percent); grade ten: 2,344 pupils (31 percent); grade eleven: 1,641 pupils (22 percent); grade twelve: 897 pupils (12 percent).

All of the schools provided tutoring in before- or after-school sessions in math, reading/writing, and E.S.L. The largest number of students received tutoring in math and the smallest number in E.S.L. In math, tutors provided assistance to 5,744 students for an average of 9.1 sessions meeting an average of 10.9 hours. In reading/writing, tutors provided assistance to

3,134 students for an average of 8.0 sessions meeting an average of 9.7 hours. In E.S.L., tutors provided assistance to 727 students meeting an average of 9.1 sessions for an average of 11.9 hours.

There were seven schools that provided in-classroom tutorials in math, reading/writing, and E.S.L.:

Humanities,
Morris,
Walton,
Boys and Girls,
Bushwick,
John Dewey, and
John Adams.

The in-classroom tutorials served 132 students in all. One hundred and nineteen students attended in-classroom tutorials in math; 33 students in reading/writing; and seven students in E.S.L.*

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

The first objective of the Peer Tutoring program was that at least 25 students at each site would participate in the before- or after-school program over the period of the school year. As can be seen in Table 1, 97 percent (59) of the 61 schools met this objective.

The second objective of the Peer Tutoring program was that at least 50 percent of the students enrolled in the before- or after-school program would participate for nine or more hours of tutorial/remedial instruction in addition to the school day. As

---

*Although only 132 students received in-class tutorials, 25 were tutored in two or three subject areas.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Students in the Before- or After-School Peer Tutoring Program Who Attended At Least Nine Hours of Tutoring

School	Number Enrolled[a]	Number Attending At Least Nine Hours	Percentage Attending At Least Nine Hours
HUMANITIES	41	16	39.0
SEWARD PARK	245	73	29.8
WASHINGTON IRVING	90	31	34.4
GEORGE WASHINGTON	182	88	48.4
LOUIS D. BRANDEIS	110	108	98.2[b]
JULIA RICHMAN	179	177	98.9[b]
MARTIN LUTHER KING	169	33	19.5
MURRY BERGTRAUM	170	82	48.2
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH	119	115	96.6[b]
FASHION INDUSTRIES	145	28	19.3
GRAPHIC COM. ARTS	63	42	66.7[b]
ART & DESIGN	80	13	16.2
MABEL D. BACON	134	132	98.5[b]
MORRIS	101	83	82.2[b]
HERBERT H. LEHMAN	29	16	55.2[b]
WILLIAM H. TAFT	70	24	34.3
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS	106	24	22.6
JAMES MONROE	58	27	46.6
EVANDER CHILDS	104	77	74.0[b]
WALTON	116	92	79.3[b]
THEO. ROOSEVELT	118	28	23.7
DeWITT CLINTON	229	37	16.2
ADLAI E. STEVENSON	273	258	94.5[b]
HARRY S. TRUMAN	21	4	19.0[b]
SOUTH BRONX	127	67	52.8[b]
JOHN F. KENNEDY	112	95	84.8[b]
SAMUEL GOMPERS	127	67	52.8[b]
GRACE H. DODGE	84	19	22.6
LAFAYETTE	64	1	1.6
SAMUEL J. TILDEN	37	37	100.0[b]
FRANKLIN K. LANE	131	126	96.2[b]
THOMAS JEFFERSON	81	38	46.9
PROSPECT HEIGHTS	140	112	80.0[b]
BOYS AND GIRLS	124	122	98.4[b]
ERASMUS HALL	179	80	44.7
GEO. W. WINGATE	327	139	42.5
BUSHWICK	526	368	70.0[b]

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

Number and Percentage of Students in the Before- or After-School Peer Tutoring Program Who Attended At Least Nine Hours of Tutoring

School	Number Enrolled[a]	Number Attending At Least Nine Hours	Percentage Attending At Least Nine Hours
FORT HAMILTON	85	27	31.8
SHEEPSHEAD BAY	177	21	11.9
CANARSIE	109	85	78.0[b]
SOUTH SHORE	85	5	6.9
JOHN DEWEY	28	28	100.0[b]
CLARA BARTON	151	78	51.7[b]
AUTOMOTIVE TRADES	38	24	63.2[b]
E.N.Y. H.S. OF TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY	107	20	18.7
WILLIAM E. GRADY	263	97	36.9
SARAH J. HALE	70	64	91.4[b]
SPRINGFIELD GARDENS	84	45	53.6[b]
JOHN BOWNE	89	18	20.2
MARTIN VAN BUREN	71	17	23.9
NEWTOWN	10	7	70.0[b]
FLUSHING	96	66	68.8[b]
FAR ROCKAWAY	192	93	48.4
JAMAICA	65	26	40.0
RICHMOND HILL	74	52	70.3[b]
JOHN ADAMS	85	49	42.6
HILLCREST	178	13	7.3
AVIATION	43	27	62.8[b]
THOMAS A. EDISON	155	42	27.1
TOTTENVILLE	149	10	6.7
RALPH MCKEE	41	10	24.4
Total	7456	3806	51

[a] Six students were omitted from this table because of missing or invalid data.

[b] These schools met or exceeded the objective that 50 percent or more of the enrolled students would be tutored for nine hours or more.

- Fifty-two percent of the enrolled students were tutored for nine hours or more.

can be seen in Table 1, 51 percent (3,806 students) of the participants for whom data were available were tutored for nine or more hours, exceeding the objective. Moreover, as can be seen in Table 2, students tutored in a combination of areas were more likely to be tutored for nine or more hours than students tutored in a single area. Seventy-five percent of students tutored in more than one area were tutored for nine hours or more.

The third objective of the Peer Tutoring program was that at least 70 percent of the students receiving peer tutoring in a classroom tutorial would pass the class in which they received tutoring. The objective was surpassed when all of the subject areas were considered. Pass/fail data were available for 155 students.* Overall, 85 percent (131) of these students received a passing grade. The success rate was most notable in the math in-class tutorials (87 percent pass rate); slightly less for the reading/writing in-class tutorials (77 percent pass rate); and less again for the E.S.L. in-class tutorials (60 percent pass rate), which serviced a very small number of students (seven students; pass/fail data available for five).

The fourth objective of the Peer Tutoring program was that by the end of June, 1990, at least five tutors at each site would be trained by a supervising teacher in methods and use of materials. As can be seen in Table 3, the 61 schools that completed the tutor training questionnaire utilized a total of

---

*Although only 132 students received in-class tutorials, 25 were tutored in two or three subject areas.

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Students in the Before- or After-School Peer Tutoring Program Who Attended At Least Nine Hours of Tutoring By Type of Tutoring Received

Type of Tutoring	Number Attending At Least Nine Hours	Percent Attending At Least Nine Hours
Mathematics Only	1602	42
Reading/Writing Only	581	46
E.S.L. Only	130	48
Math. & Reading/Writing Only	1208	77
Math. & E.S.L. Only	131	68
Reading/Writing & E.S.L. Only	54	44
Math., Reading/Writing & E.S.L.	100	88
Total	3806	51

[a] Seventy-three students were omitted from the table because of missing or invalid data.

- Seventy-five percent of students tutored in more than one subject area were tutored for nine hours or more.

Table 3

Number of Tutors and Number of Trained Tutors Per Site

School	Number of Tutors	Number of Trained Tutors
HUMANITIES	11	7*
SEWARD PARK	20	20*
WASHINGTON IRVING	13	13*
GEORGE WASHINGTON	9	0
LOUIS D. BRANDEIS	15	12*
JULIA RICHMAN	10	6*
MARTIN LUTHER KING	15	14*
MURRY BERGTRAUM	16	16*
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH	10	9*
FASHION INDUSTRIES	7	7*
NORMAN THOMAS	4	4
GRAPHIC COMM. ARTS	12	11*
ART & DESIGN	20	20*
MABEL D. BACON	3	3
MORRIS	15	7*
HERBERT H. LEHMAN	10	10*
WILLIAM H. TAFT	12	12*
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS	5	2
JAMES MONROE	8	8*
EVANDER CHILDS	12	8*
WALTON	14	14*
THEO. ROOSEVELT	11	11*
DeWITT CLINTON	21	21*
ADLAI E. STEVENSON	26	26*
HARRY S. TRUMAN	11	11*
SOUTH BRONX	13	10*
JOHN F. KENNEDY	7	7*
SAMUEL GOMPERS	8	5*
GRACE H. DODGE	7	7*
LAFAYETTE	7	6*
SAMUEL J. TILDEN	15	11*
FRANKLIN K. LANE	13	13*
THOMAS JEFFERSON	15	14*
PROSPECT HEIGHTS	9	9*
ERASMUS HALL	13	11*
GEO. W. WINGATE	42	20*
BUSHWICK	29	29*
FORT HAMILTON	22	22*
SHEEPSHEAD BAY	15	9*

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

Number of Tutors and Number of Trained Tutors Per Site

School	Number of Tutors	Number of Trained Tutors
CANARSIE	6	6*
SOUTH SHORE	7	7*
JOHN DEWEY	3	1
CLARA BARTON	10	10*
AUTOMOTIVE TRADES	15	0
EAST N.Y. H.S. OF TRANSIT TECHNOLOGY	13	9*
WILLIAM E. GRADY	9	8*
SARAH J. HALE	5	5*
SPRINGFIELD GARDENS	8	8*
JOHN BOWNE	15	15*
MARTIN VAN BUREN	5	5*
NEWTOWN	3	3
FLUSHING	8	8*
FAR ROCKAWAY	7	4
JAMAICA	6	3
RICHMOND HILL	7	0
JOHN ADAMS	8	3
HILLCREST	22	22*
AVIATION	13	8*
THOMAS A. EDISON	12	11*
TOTTENVILLE	11	7*
RALPH MCKEE	3	3
Total	721	591

* These schools met or exceeded the objective that five or more tutors per site would be trained in 1989-90.

- Forty-nine schools met or exceeded the objective that five or more tutors per site would be trained in 1989-90.

721 tutors ($\underline{X}$ = 12; $\underline{S.D.}$ = 6.7), including 591 trained tutors ($\underline{X}$ = 6; $\underline{S.D.}$ = 6). Eighty percent (49 schools), consistent with the objective, utilized five or more tutors trained in 1989-90. OREA asked schools why some of the individual tutors had not been trained. Most frequently, schools cited "returned tutor" (32 tutors; 52 percent of the untrained tutors) as a reason. Less frequently, schools cited "tutor's skills did not necessitate training" (9 tutors; 15 percent of the untrained tutors) as a reason.

OREA also asked schools about topics presented during tutor training. Training topics utilized by more than half of the schools included interpersonal, instructional, and administrative issues in remediation as follows:

- tutor-tutee relationships (57 schools - 92 percent);
- math remediation (54 schools - 87 percent);
- reading remediation (44 schools - 71 percent);
- writing remediation (43 schools - 69 percent);
- remediation techniques in general (45 schools - 73 percent);
- completion of payroll forms (37 schools - 60 percent).

On the previous year's questionnaire (1988-89), schools had been asked about peer tutoring options they were interested in implementing. Schools most frequently responded: "service credit in addition to pay" (57 percent of responses), and "computer-assisted tutorial instruction" (68 percent of responses). On the current year's questionnaire (1989-90), a small number of schools cited these options as strategies that they had used for the first time in 1989-90: eight percent (5 schools) implemented service credit and pay for the first time,

and eight percent (5 schools) implemented computer-assisted tutorial instruction. However, on the current year's questionnaire (1989-90), a number of schools cited these same options as strategies that they were still interested in implementing in the future: 37 percent (23 schools) indicated an interest in service credit and pay, and 60 percent (37 schools) indicated an interest in computer-assisted tutorial instruction. Other options in which schools indicated considerable interest in future implementation were as follows:

- independent study plus pay (28 schools - 45 percent);
- in-class tutorials (17 schools - 27 percent);
- internship component (16 schools - 26 percent);
- independent study without pay (10 schools - 16 percent);
- service credit without pay (five schools - 8 percent).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The participating schools were successful in reaching the objectives of the program. Ninety-seven percent of the schools met the objective concerning number of students at each site participating in the before- or after-school program. The program as a whole met the objectives concerning proportion of students in the before- or after-school program attending nine or more hours of remediation and the proportion of students in the in-classroom tutorial program passing the classes concerned. Eighty percent of the schools met the objective concerning number of trained tutors at each site.

In questionnaire responses in both 1988-89 and 1989-90, a number of the schools indicated an interest in a variety of options for the future, including computer-assisted tutorial

instruction. A small number of schools did implement that option for the first time in 1989-90, but the majority of interested schools did not. It is recommended that the schools be encouraged to implement such options and then to assess the educational impact of these changes in their program.